



Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

2013.10.13 Venice database

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Tue, Oct 13, 2015 at 5:00 PM

To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Garen:

Here is the revised dbase.

- All edits are in RED font.

- I have temporarily unhidden all the columns between AC and BJ so that you can easily see exactly where I made the edits for the LAUSD property and the LA Public Library (LAPL) parcel. Also, if the edits caused a change in the total assessment/%, I also turned the total assessment and % fields red (just the LAUSD and LAPL parcels as discussed further below.)

Complete list of all changes:

a) 4238002902 - LAUSD - changed bldg SF based on architectural drawings with dimensions as furnished by LAUSD (total SF is 76287, but they only pay 40% on bldg sf per memo.) The 40% occurs in the formula in column AI.

b) 4238018900 - LA Public Library (this single parcel also contains a pocket park, a pedestrian path/walkway and surface parking) - there are two changes per discussion with Miranda et al after first draft MDP/ER review: 1) make this parcel Zone 2/apply Zone 2 rate (reasoning: it is not commercial-use + hours of operation are more consistent with Zone 2 parcels) and 2) remove marketing portion of the assessment (again, it is not a commercial use and does not benefit from marketing.) The removal of the 7% for marketing occurs in the formula in columns AI, AS and AZ (all shown in red font) as a reduction to the bldg, lot and frontage #s (*0.93.)

c) Mailing address have been added for a few dozen parcels - most of these were condos that were fairly new/not recorded when we did the original dbase. All are in red. We also re-ran all the condos listed under owner THORNTON VENICE OWNER LLC to see if they had sold, but they still show the same owner of record.

d) I do believe that I found and removed the \$ in the formulas that you said were throwing off the sort. I did a sort for \$ in formulas and removed them all. You telling me what was wrong was a big help - it made them easy to find. Thank you!

2) The main database (first tab) is 100% updated for your review. There are no more changes unless our second review raises more issues. I will be reviewing and updating the remaining tabs in the attached (all of which are just tables used for the MDP or ER) in the next day or so, although I believe all but the Public Parcels tab are automated. **I will resubmit the database to you then, with the red font removed, and the superfluous columns between AC and BJ hidden (the "streamlined" view I normally send you.)**

Please let me know if you have any questions!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

 2015.10.13 Venice revised - LAUSD and LAPL changes + mailing addresses added.xlsx
254K



Re: 2013.10.13 Venice database

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Wed, Oct 21, 2015 at 3:18 PM

To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Just checking in to see if you had a chance to review the changes...

If you're okay with them, please let me know so:

- 1) We can complete all the corresponding MDP/ER changes.
- 2) I can send you a cleaned up version (color font highlights removed and superfluous columns hidden).

If you have any questions, give me a call: 310-430-5121 cell.

Hope you are well!

Tara

On Tue, Oct 13, 2015 at 5:00 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Garen:

Here is the revised dbase.

- All edits are in RED font.

- I have temporarily unhidden all the columns between AC and BJ so that you can easily see exactly where I made the edits for the LAUSD property and the LA Public Library (LAPL) parcel. Also, if the edits caused a change in the total assessment/%, I also turned the total assessment and % fields red (just the LAUSD and LAPL parcels as discussed further below.)

Complete list of all changes:

- a) 4238002902 - LAUSD - changed bldg SF based on architectural drawings with dimensions as furnished by LAUSD (total SF is 76287, but they only pay 40% on bldg sf per memo.) The 40% occurs in the formula in column AI.
- b) 4238018900 - LA Public Library (this single parcel also contains a pocket park, a pedestrian path/walkway and surface parking) - there are two changes per discussion with Miranda et al after first draft MDP/ER review: 1) make this parcel Zone 2/apply Zone 2 rate (reasoning: it is not commercial-use + hours of operation are more consistent with Zone 2 parcels) and 2) remove marketing portion of the assessment (again, it is not a commercial use and does not benefit from marketing.) The removal of the 7% for marketing occurs in the formula in columns AI, AS and AZ (all shown in red font) as a reduction to the bldg, lot and frontage #s (*0.93.)
- c) Mailing address have been added for a few dozen parcels - most of these were condos that were fairly new/not recorded when we did the original dbase. All are in red. We also re-ran all the condos listed under owner THORNTON VENICE OWNER LLC to see if they had sold, but they still show the same owner of record.
- d) I do believe that I found and removed the \$ in the formulas that you said were throwing off the sort. I did a sort for \$ in formulas and removed them all. You telling me what was wrong was a big help - it made them easy to find. Thank you!

2) The main database (first tab) is 100% updated for your review. There are no more changes unless our second review raises more issues. I will be reviewing and updating the remaining tabs in the attached (all of which are just tables used for the MDP or ER) in the next day or so, although I believe all but the Public Parcels tab are automated. **I will resubmit the database to you then, with the red font removed, and the superfluous columns between AC and BJ hidden (the "streamlined" view I normally send you.)**

Please let me know if you have any questions!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts



Re: 2013.10.13 Venice database

1 message

Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 8:36 AM

To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Good Morning Tara,

I just looked the database over, per your guidance, just the first tab, pending any other changes (hopefully none) that must be made.

I will reference things based on the letters in your e-mail.

a) & b) The numbers are correct, but there is a different issue that arises, which, when I noticed it here, led me to check other parcels that might have the same situation, and it exists. The adjustments being made – 7% marketing, 40% and 25% per LAUSD's rules – should be entered in column BI where the assessment is finally calculated. Otherwise, we end up with "wrong" square or linear footages showing in the columns. I apologize for not bringing this up earlier, I did not know this was the correct way to do it.

c) OK

d) I see the problem has been fixed, but, ironically a related problem has cropped up. In column BJ, the ABSENCE of \$ signs in the denominator is creating a problem when the data is sorted. It doesn't make sense, sorting the data causes the percentages to disappear and error messages to appear. So the denominator should read "\$BI\$466.

e) New item, the ownership on 4286030903 should be LA City, not State of Calif.

Let me know if anything is unclear.

G

On Tue, Oct 13, 2015 at 5:00 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Garen:

Here is the revised dbase.

- All edits are in RED font.

- I have temporarily unhidden all the columns between AC and BJ so that you can easily see exactly where I made the edits for the LAUSD property and the LA Public Library (LAPL) parcel. Also, if the edits caused a change in the total assessment/%, I also turned the total assessment and % fields red (just the LAUSD and LAPL parcels as discussed further below.)

Complete list of all changes:

a) 4238002902 - LAUSD - changed bldg SF based on architectural drawings with dimensions as furnished by LAUSD (total SF is 76287, but they only pay 40% on bldg sf per memo.) The 40% occurs in the formula in column AI.

b) 4238018900 - LA Public Library (this single parcel also contains a pocket park, a pedestrian path/walkway and surface parking) - there are two changes per discussion with Miranda et al after first draft MDP/ER review: 1) make this parcel Zone 2/apply Zone 2 rate (reasoning: it is not commercial-use + hours of operation are more consistent with Zone 2 parcels) and 2) remove marketing portion of the assessment (again, it is not a commercial use and does not benefit from marketing.) The removal of the 7% for marketing occurs in the formula in columns AI, AS and AZ (all shown in red font) as a reduction to the bldg, lot and frontage #s (*0.93.)

c) Mailing address have been added for a few dozen parcels - most of these were condos that were fairly new/not recorded when we did the original dbase. All are in red. We also re-ran all the condos listed under owner THORNTON VENICE OWNER LLC to see if they had sold, but they still show the same owner of record.

d) I do believe that I found and removed the \$ in the formulas that you said were throwing off the sort. I did a sort for \$ in formulas and removed them all. You telling me what was wrong was a big help - it made them easy to find.
Thank you!

2) The main database (first tab) is 100% updated for your review. There are no more changes unless our second review raises more issues. I will be reviewing and updating the remaining tabs in the attached (all of which are just tables used for the MDP or ER) in the next day or so, although I believe all but the Public Parcels tab are automated. **I will resubmit the database to you then, with the red font removed, and the superfluous columns between AC and BJ hidden (the "streamlined" view I normally send you.)**

Please let me know if you have any questions!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621



Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Re: 2013.10.13 Venice database

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 8:59 AM

A&B

On SPII, this is how we did it, and our logic was as follows:

We made the reductions at the lowest level - we believe that the bldg, lot, and frontage figures should really only reflect what's actually being assessed. You can still see the unreduced figures by looking at the formula if your curious, but the unreduced figures are really moot. The reality is that there are really substantial differences for some of these parcels (actual vs. assessed quantities.) We think it's disingenuous (and confusing to the untrained person) to see bldg, lot, and frontage totals on which the assessment is not actually based at all.

We would respectfully appeal/ask you to reconsider our point of view before we make this change.

C, D & E - no problem. We'll fix.

Will re-send later today. Thank you very much!

On Oct 22, 2015 8:36 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

Good Morning Tara,

I just looked the database over, per your guidance, just the first tab, pending any other changes (hopefully none) that must be made.

I will reference things based on the letters in your e-mail.

a) & b) The numbers are correct, but there is a different issue that arises, which, when I noticed it here, led me to check other parcels that might have the same situation, and it exists. The adjustments being made -- 7% marketing, 40% and 25% per LAUSD's rules -- should be entered in column BI where the assessment is finally calculated. Otherwise, we end up with "wrong" square or linear footages showing in the columns. I apologize for not bringing this up earlier, I did not know this was the correct way to do it.

c) OK

d) I see the problem has been fixed, but, ironically a related problem has cropped up. In column BJ, the ABSENCE of \$ signs in the denominator is creating a problem when the data is sorted. It doesn't make sense, sorting the data causes the percentages to disappear and error messages to appear. So the denominator should read "\$BI\$466.

e) New item, the ownership on 4286030903 should be LA City, not State of Calif.

Let me know if anything is unclear.

G

On Tue, Oct 13, 2015 at 5:00 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Garen:

Here is the revised dbase.

- All edits are in RED font.

- I have temporarily unhidden all the columns between AC and BJ so that you can easily see exactly where I made the edits for the LAUSD property and the LA Public Library (LAPL) parcel. Also, if the edits caused a change in the total assessment/%, I also turned the total assessment and % fields red (just the LAUSD and LAPL parcels as discussed further below.)

Complete list of all changes:

a) 4238002902 - LAUSD - changed bldg SF based on architectural drawings with dimensions as furnished by LAUSD (total SF is 76287, but they only pay 40% on bldg sf per memo.) The 40% occurs in the formula in column AI.

b) 4238018900 - LA Public Library (this single parcel also contains a pocket park, a pedestrian path/walkway and surface parking) - there are two changes per discussion with Miranda et al after first draft MDP/ER review: 1) make this parcel Zone 2/apply Zone 2 rate (reasoning: it is not commercial-use + hours of operation are more consistent with Zone 2 parcels) and 2) remove marketing portion of the assessment (again, it is not a commercial use and does not benefit from marketing.) The removal of the 7% for marketing occurs in the formula in columns AI, AS and AZ (all shown in red font) as a reduction to the bldg, lot and frontage #s (*0.93.)

c) Mailing address have been added for a few dozen parcels - most of these were condos that were fairly new/not recorded when we did the original dbase. All are in red. We also re-ran all the condos listed under owner THORNTON VENICE OWNER LLC to see if they had sold, but they still show the same owner of record.

d) I do believe that I found and removed the \$ in the formulas that you said were throwing off the sort. I did a sort for \$ in formulas and removed them all. You telling me what was wrong was a big help - it made them easy to find. Thank you!

2) The main database (first tab) is 100% updated for your review. There are no more changes unless our second review raises more issues. I will be reviewing and updating the remaining tabs in the attached (all of which are just tables used for the MDP or ER) in the next day or so, although I believe all but the Public Parcels tab are automated. **I will resubmit the database to you then, with the red font removed, and the superfluous columns between AC and BJ hidden (the "streamlined" view I normally send you.)**

Please let me know if you have any questions!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621



Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Re: 2013.10.13 Venice database

1 message

Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 9:41 AM

To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Hi Tara,

Regarding South Park II, that's something we should have noticed and corrected.

But the problem is one of clarity and precision. Picture, eight years from now, we're compiling data, who's going to remember that these "invisible" adjustments were made?

I have a suggestion which will keep both the original, raw, data columns and the assessment columns clean.

Why not add a column for each of the three bases that we could name the "Btotal-adjusted" column (similarly for frontage and lot). This would contain either the adjusted figure or simply the original figure carried over.

Then, the assessment column would read the number from adjusted column.

This way, all concerns are addressed.

What do you think of this solution?

G

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 8:59 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

A&B

On SPII, this is how we did it, and our logic was as follows:

We made the reductions at the lowest level - we believe that the bldg, lot, and frontage figures should really only reflect what's actually being assessed. You can still see the unreduced figures by looking at the formula if your curious, but the unreduced figures are really moot. The reality is that there are really substantial differences for some of these parcels (actual vs. assessed quantities.) We think it's disingenuous (and confusing to the untrained person) to see bldg, lot, and frontage totals on which the assessment is not actually based at all.

We would respectfully appeal/ask you to reconsider our point of view before we make this change.

C, D & E - no problem. We'll fix.

Will re-send later today. Thank you very much!

On Oct 22, 2015 8:36 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

Good Morning Tara,

I just looked the database over, per your guidance, just the first tab, pending any other changes (hopefully none) that must be made.

I will reference things based on the letters in your e-mail.

a) & b) The numbers are correct, but there is a different issue that arises, which, when I noticed it here, led me to check other parcels that might have the same situation, and it exists. The adjustments being made -- 7% marketing, 40% and 25% per LAUSD's rules -- should be entered in column BI where the assessment is finally calculated. Otherwise, we end up with "wrong" square or linear footages showing in the columns. I apologize for not bringing this up earlier, I did not know this was the correct way to do it.

c) OK

d) I see the problem has been fixed, but, ironically a related problem has cropped up. In column BJ, the ABSENCE of \$ signs in the denominator is creating a problem when the data is sorted. It doesn't make sense, sorting the data causes the percentages to disappear and error messages to appear. So the denominator should read "\$BI\$466.

e) New item, the ownership on 4286030903 should be LA City, not State of Calif.

Let me know if anything is unclear.

G

On Tue, Oct 13, 2015 at 5:00 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Garen:

Here is the revised dbase.

- All edits are in RED font.

- I have temporarily unhidden all the columns between AC and BJ so that you can easily see exactly where I made the edits for the LAUSD property and the LA Public Library (LAPL) parcel. Also, if the edits caused a change in the total assessment/%, I also turned the total assessment and % fields red (just the LAUSD and LAPL parcels as discussed further below.)

Complete list of all changes:

a) 4238002902 - LAUSD - changed bldg SF based on architectural drawings with dimensions as furnished by LAUSD (total SF is 76287, but they only pay 40% on bldg sf per memo.) The 40% occurs in the formula in column AI.

b) 4238018900 - LA Public Library (this single parcel also contains a pocket park, a pedestrian path/walkway and surface parking) - there are two changes per discussion with Miranda et al after first draft MDP/ER review: 1) make this parcel Zone 2/apply Zone 2 rate (reasoning: it is not commercial-use + hours of operation are more consistent with Zone 2 parcels) and 2) remove marketing portion of the assessment (again, it is not a commercial use and does not benefit from marketing.) The removal of the 7% for marketing occurs in the formula in columns AI, AS and AZ (all shown in red font) as a reduction to the bldg, lot and frontage #s (*0.93.)

c) Mailing address have been added for a few dozen parcels - most of these were condos that were fairly new/not recorded when we did the original dbase. All are in red. We also re-ran all the condos listed under owner THORNTON VENICE OWNER LLC to see if they had sold, but they still show the same owner of record.

d) I do believe that I found and removed the \$ in the formulas that you said were throwing off the sort. I did a sort for \$ in formulas and removed them all. You telling me what was wrong was a big help - it made them easy to find. Thank you!

2) The main database (first tab) is 100% updated for your review. There are no more changes unless our second review raises more issues. I will be reviewing and updating the remaining tabs in the attached (all of which are just tables used for the MDP or ER) in the next day or so, although I believe all but the Public Parcels tab are automated. **I will resubmit the database to you then, with the red font removed, and the superfluous columns between AC and BJ hidden (the "streamlined" view I normally send you.)**

Please let me know if you have any questions!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621



Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Re: 2013.10.13 Venice database

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 9:49 AM

To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Well, I will swear up and down that I will remember :)

I have a great memory for most details (I remember my thought process that goes into decisions like these.)

But I'll go with your suggestion. I like it much better than having a final assessment that isn't actually based on the bldg, lot, frontage numbers being shown. I think that's really confusing for any lay person who looks at the data.

On Oct 22, 2015 9:41 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

Hi Tara,

Regarding South Park II, that's something we should have noticed and corrected.

But the problem is one of clarity and precision. Picture, eight years from now, we're compiling data, who's going to remember that these "invisible" adjustments were made?

I have a suggestion which will keep both the original, raw, data columns and the assessment columns clean.

Why not add a column for each of the three bases that we could name the "Btotal-adjusted" column (similarly for frontage and lot). This would contain either the adjusted figure or simply the original figure carried over.

Then, the assessment column would read the number from adjusted column.

This way, all concerns are addressed.

What do you think of this solution?

G

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 8:59 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

A&B

On SP11, this is how we did it, and our logic was as follows:

We made the reductions at the lowest level - we believe that the bldg, lot, and frontage figures should really only reflect what's actually being assessed. You can still see the unreduced figures by looking at the formula if your curious, but the unreduced figures are really moot. The reality is that there are really substantial differences for some of these parcels (actual vs. assessed quantities.) We think it's disingenuous (and confusing to the untrained person) to see bldg, lot, and frontage totals on which the assessment is not actually based at all.

We would respectfully appeal/ask you to reconsider our point of view before we make this change.

C, D & E - no problem. We'll fix.

Will re-send later today. Thank you very much!

On Oct 22, 2015 8:36 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

Good Morning Tara,

I just looked the database over, per your guidance, just the first tab, pending any other changes (hopefully none) that must be made.

I will reference things based on the letters in your e-mail.

a) & b) The numbers are correct, but there is a different issue that arises, which, when I noticed it here, led me to check other parcels that might have the same situation, and it exists. The adjustments being made – 7% marketing, 40% and 25% per LAUSD's rules – should be entered in column BI where the assessment is finally calculated. Otherwise, we end up with "wrong" square or linear footages showing in the columns. I apologize for not bringing this up earlier, I did not know this was the correct way to do it.

c) OK

d) I see the problem has been fixed, but, ironically a related problem has cropped up. In column BJ, the ABSENCE of \$ signs in the denominator is creating a problem when the data is sorted. It doesn't make sense, sorting the data causes the percentages to disappear and error messages to appear. So the denominator should read "\$BI\$466.

e) New item, the ownership on 4286030903 should be LA City, not State of Calif.

Let me know if anything is unclear.

G

On Tue, Oct 13, 2015 at 5:00 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Garen:

Here is the revised dbase.

- All edits are in RED font.

- I have temporarily unhidden all the columns between AC and BJ so that you can easily see exactly where I made the edits for the LAUSD property and the LA Public Library (LAPL) parcel. Also, if the edits caused a change in the total assessment/%, I also turned the total assessment and % fields red (just the LAUSD and LAPL parcels as discussed further below.)

Complete list of all changes:

a) 4238002902 - LAUSD - changed bldg SF based on architectural drawings with dimensions as furnished by LAUSD (total SF is 76287, but they only pay 40% on bldg sf per memo.) The 40% occurs in the formula in column AI.

b) 4238018900 - LA Public Library (this single parcel also contains a pocket park, a pedestrian path/walkway and surface parking) - there are two changes per discussion with Miranda et al after first draft MDP/ER review: 1) make this parcel Zone 2/apply Zone 2 rate (reasoning: it is not commercial-use + hours of operation are more consistent with Zone 2 parcels) and 2) remove marketing portion of the assessment (again, it is not a commercial use and does not benefit from marketing.) The removal of the 7% for marketing occurs in the formula in columns AI, AS and AZ (all shown in red font) as a reduction to the bldg, lot and frontage #s (*0.93.)

c) Mailing address have been added for a few dozen parcels - most of these were condos that were fairly new/not recorded when we did the original dbase. All are in red. We also re-ran all the condos listed under owner THORNTON VENICE OWNER LLC to see if they had sold, but they still show the same owner of record.

d) I do believe that I found and removed the \$ in the formulas that you said were throwing off the sort. I did a sort for \$ in formulas and removed them all. You telling me what was wrong was a big help - it made them easy to find. Thank you!

2) The main database (first tab) is 100% updated for your review. There are no more changes unless our second review raises more issues. I will be reviewing and updating the remaining tabs in the attached (all of which are just tables used for the MDP or ER) in the next day or so, although I believe all but the Public Parcels tab are automated. **I will resubmit the database to you then, with the red font removed, and the superfluous columns between AC and BJ hidden (the "streamlined" view I normally send you.)**

Please let me know if you have any questions!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE

DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621



Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Re: 2013.10.13 Venice database

1 message

Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>
To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 9:52 AM

Great, thank you Tara.

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 9:49 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Well, I will swear up and down that I will remember :)

I have a great memory for most details (I remember my thought process that goes into decisions like these.)

But I'll go with your suggestion. I like it much better than having a final assessment that isn't actually based on the bldg, lot, frontage numbers being shown. I think that's really confusing for any lay person who looks at the data.

On Oct 22, 2015 9:41 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

Hi Tara,

Regarding South Park II, that's something we should have noticed and corrected.

But the problem is one of clarity and precision. Picture, eight years from now, we're compiling data, who's going to remember that these "invisible" adjustments were made?

I have a suggestion which will keep both the original, raw, data columns and the assessment columns clean.

Why not add a column for each of the three bases that we could name the "Btotal-adjusted" column (similarly for frontage and lot). This would contain either the adjusted figure or simply the original figure carried over.

Then, the assessment column would read the number from adjusted column.

This way, all concerns are addressed.

What do you think of this solution?

G

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 8:59 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

A&B

On SPII, this is how we did it, and our logic was as follows:

We made the reductions at the lowest level - we believe that the bldg, lot, and frontage figures should really only reflect what's actually being assessed. You can still see the unreduced figures by looking at the formula if your curious, but the unreduced figures are really moot. The reality is that there are really substantial differences for some of these parcels (actual vs. assessed quantities.) We think it's disingenuous (and confusing to the untrained person) to see bldg, lot, and frontage totals on which the assessment is not actually based at all.

We would respectfully appeal/ask you to reconsider our point of view before we make this change.

C, D & E - no problem. We'll fix.

Will re-send later today. Thank you very much!

On Oct 22, 2015 8:36 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

Good Morning Tara,

I just looked the database over, per your guidance, just the first tab, pending any other changes (hopefully none) that must be made.

I will reference things based on the letters in your e-mail.

a) & b) The numbers are correct, but there is a different issue that arises, which, when I noticed it here, led me to check other parcels that might have the same situation, and it exists. The adjustments being made -- 7% marketing, 40% and 25% per LAUSD's rules -- should be entered in column BI where the assessment is finally calculated. Otherwise, we end up with "wrong" square or linear footages showing in the columns. I apologize for not bringing this up earlier, I did not know this was the correct way to do it.

c) OK

d) I see the problem has been fixed, but, ironically a related problem has cropped up. In column BJ, the ABSENCE of \$ signs in the denominator is creating a problem when the data is sorted. It doesn't make sense, sorting the data causes the percentages to disappear and error messages to appear. So the denominator should read "\$BI\$466.

e) New item, the ownership on 4286030903 should be LA City, not State of Calif.

Let me know if anything is unclear.

G

On Tue, Oct 13, 2015 at 5:00 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Garen:

Here is the revised dbase.

- All edits are in RED font.

- I have temporarily unhidden all the columns between AC and BJ so that you can easily see exactly where I made the edits for the LAUSD property and the LA Public Library (LAPL) parcel. Also, if the edits caused a change in the total assessment/%, I also turned the total assessment and % fields red (just the LAUSD and LAPL parcels as discussed further below.)

Complete list of all changes:

a) 4238002902 - LAUSD - changed bldg SF based on architectural drawings with dimensions as furnished by LAUSD (total SF is 76287, but they only pay 40% on bldg sf per memo.) The 40% occurs in the formula in column AI.

b) 4238018900 - LA Public Library (this single parcel also contains a pocket park, a pedestrian path/walkway and surface parking) - there are two changes per discussion with Miranda et al after first draft MDP/ER review: 1) make this parcel Zone 2/apply Zone 2 rate (reasoning: it is not commercial-use + hours of operation are more consistent with Zone 2 parcels) and 2) remove marketing portion of the assessment (again, it is not a commercial use and does not benefit from marketing.) The removal of the 7% for marketing occurs in the formula in columns AI, AS and AZ (all shown in red font) as a reduction to the bldg, lot and frontage #s (*0.93.)

c) Mailing address have been added for a few dozen parcels - most of these were condos that were fairly new/not recorded when we did the original dbase. All are in red. We also re-ran all the condos listed under owner THORNTON VENICE OWNER LLC to see if they had sold, but they still show the same owner of record.

d) I do believe that I found and removed the \$ in the formulas that you said were throwing off the sort. I did a sort for \$ in formulas and removed them all. You telling me what was wrong was a big help - it made them easy to find. Thank you!

2) The main database (first tab) is 100% updated for your review. There are no more changes unless our second review raises more issues. I will be reviewing and updating the remaining tabs in the attached (all of which are just tables used for the MDP or ER) in the next day or so, although I believe all but the Public Parcels tab are automated. **I will resubmit the database to you then, with the red font removed, and the superfluous columns between AC and BJ hidden (the "streamlined" view I normally send you.)**

Please let me know if you have any questions!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621





Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Re: 2013.10.13 Venice database

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 12:40 PM

I'm removing the red font used for the last changes that you've reviewed.

Unless you want me to leave the columns unhidden, I'll deliver the next version in the cleaned-up/streamlined format (non-essential columns hidden). That way you can unhide the columns to look at the newly added columns, but will have a "final" version ready to go (assuming no new issues arise.)

Is that ok with you?

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 9:52 AM, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
Great, thank you Tara.

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 9:49 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Well, I will swear up and down that I will remember :)

I have a great memory for most details (I remember my thought process that goes into decisions like these.)

But I'll go with your suggestion. I like it much better than having a final assessment that isn't actually based on the bldg, lot, frontage numbers being shown. I think that's really confusing for any lay person who looks at the data.

On Oct 22, 2015 9:41 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
Hi Tara,

Regarding South Park II, that's something we should have noticed and corrected.

But the problem is one of clarity and precision. Picture, eight years from now, we're compiling data, who's going to remember that these "invisible" adjustments were made?

I have a suggestion which will keep both the original, raw, data columns and the assessment columns clean.

Why not add a column for each of the three bases that we could name the "Btotal-adjusted" column (similarly for frontage and lot). This would contain either the adjusted figure or simply the original figure carried over.

Then, the assessment column would read the number from adjusted column.

This way, all concerns are addressed.

What do you think of this solution?

G

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 8:59 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

A&B

On SPII, this is how we did it, and our logic was as follows:

We made the reductions at the lowest level - we believe that the bldg, lot, and frontage figures should really only reflect what's actually being assessed. You can still see the unreduced figures by looking at the formula if your curious, but the unreduced figures are really moot. The reality is that there are really substantial differences for some of these parcels (actual vs. assessed quantities.) We think it's disingenuous (and confusing to the untrained person) to see bldg, lot, and frontage totals on which the assessment is not actually based at all.

We would respectfully appeal/ask you to reconsider our point of view before we make this change.

C, D & E - no problem. We'll fix.

Will re-send later today. Thank you very much!

On Oct 22, 2015 8:36 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

Good Morning Tara,

I just looked the database over, per your guidance, just the first tab, pending any other changes (hopefully none) that must be made.

I will reference things based on the letters in your e-mail.

a) & b) The numbers are correct, but there is a different issue that arises, which, when I noticed it here, led me to check other parcels that might have the same situation, and it exists. The adjustments being made -- 7% marketing, 40% and 25% per LAUSD's rules -- should be entered in column BI where the assessment is finally calculated. Otherwise, we end up with "wrong" square or linear footages showing in the columns. I apologize for not bringing this up earlier, I did not know this was the correct way to do it.

c) OK

d) I see the problem has been fixed, but, ironically a related problem has cropped up. In column BJ, the ABSENCE of \$ signs in the denominator is creating a problem when the data is sorted. It doesn't make sense, sorting the data causes the percentages to disappear and error messages to appear. So the denominator should read "\$BI\$466.

e) New item, the ownership on 4286030903 should be LA City, not State of Calif.

Let me know if anything is unclear.

G

On Tue, Oct 13, 2015 at 5:00 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Garen:

Here is the revised dbase.

- All edits are in RED font.

- I have temporarily unhidden all the columns between AC and BJ so that you can easily see exactly where I made the edits for the LAUSD property and the LA Public Library (LAPL) parcel. Also, if the edits caused a change in the total assessment/%, I also turned the total assessment and % fields red (just the LAUSD and LAPL parcels as discussed further below.)

Complete list of all changes:

a) 4238002902 - LAUSD - changed bldg SF based on architectural drawings with dimensions as furnished by LAUSD (total SF is 76287, but they only pay 40% on bldg sf per memo.) The 40% occurs in the formula in column AI.

b) 4238018900 - LA Public Library (this single parcel also contains a pocket park, a pedestrian path/walkway and surface parking) - there are two changes per discussion with Miranda et al after first draft MDP/ER review: 1) make this parcel Zone 2/apply Zone 2 rate (reasoning: it is not commercial-use + hours of operation are more consistent with Zone 2 parcels) and 2) remove marketing portion of the assessment (again, it is not a commercial use and does not benefit from marketing.) The removal of the 7% for marketing occurs in the formula in columns AI, AS and AZ (all shown in red font) as a reduction to the bldg, lot and frontage #s (*0.93.)

c) Mailing address have been added for a few dozen parcels - most of these were condos that were fairly new/not recorded when we did the original dbase. All are in red. We also re-ran all the condos listed under owner THORNTON VENICE OWNER LLC to see if they had sold, but they still show the same owner of record.

d) I do believe that I found and removed the \$ in the formulas that you said were throwing off the sort. I did a sort for \$ in formulas and removed them all. You telling me what was wrong was a big help - it made them easy to find. Thank you!

2) The main database (first tab) is 100% updated for your review. There are no more changes unless our second review raises more issues. I will be reviewing and updating the remaining tabs in the attached (all of which are just tables used for the MDP or ER) in the next day or so, although I believe all but the Public Parcels tab are automated. **I will resubmit the database to you then, with the red font removed, and the superfluous columns between AC and BJ hidden (the "streamlined" view I normally send you.)**

Please let me know if you have any questions!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St., #110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621





Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Re: 2013.10.13 Venice database

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 12:58 PM

To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

One more quick note. I started creating BTotalAdj, FTotalAdj, LTotalAdj columns, however, I immediately realized that approach has a big downside. It causes a problem with the assessment formula calculation. All of the assessment formulas for all adjusted parcels (at least 20) must then pull the building, lot, or frontage total from a different column than the non-adjusted parcels. Or else I have to carry over non-adjusted parcels' numbers into the adjusted column and calculate assessments using that new column (which would also be really confusing, since most parcels aren't adjusted.)

While I could do either of the above, it seems overly complicated and more prone to end up with inadvertently corrupted data. From a data standpoint, I think it's much easier to do what you originally suggested and move the adjustment calculations out of the bldg, lot, frontage and just apply to the total assessment. I don't love that scenario, but it is much cleaner/simpler. I suppose few lay people ever look at the database, so maybe that's just better. I will proceed along the lines you originally suggested.

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 9:49 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Well, I will swear up and down that I will remember :)

I have a great memory for most details (I remember my thought process that goes into decisions like these.)

But I'll go with your suggestion. I like it much better than having a final assessment that isn't actually based on the bldg, lot, frontage numbers being shown. I think that's really confusing for any lay person who looks at the data.

On Oct 22, 2015 9:41 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

Hi Tara,

Regarding South Park II, that's something we should have noticed and corrected.

But the problem is one of clarity and precision. Picture, eight years from now, we're compiling data, who's going to remember that these "invisible" adjustments were made?

I have a suggestion which will keep both the original, raw, data columns and the assessment columns clean.

Why not add a column for each of the three bases that we could name the "Btotal-adjusted" column (similarly for frontage and lot). This would contain either the adjusted figure or simply the original figure carried over.

Then, the assessment column would read the number from adjusted column.

This way, all concerns are addressed.

What do you think of this solution?

G

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 8:59 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

A&B

On SPII, this is how we did it, and our logic was as follows:

We made the reductions at the lowest level - we believe that the bldg, lot, and frontage figures should really only reflect what's actually being assessed. You can still see the unreduced figures by looking at the formula if your curious, but the unreduced figures are really moot. The reality is that there are really substantial differences for some of these parcels (actual vs. assessed quantities.) We think it's disingenuous (and confusing to the untrained person) to see bldg, lot, and frontage totals on which the assessment is not actually based at all.

We would respectfully appeal/ask you to reconsider our point of view before we make this change.

C, D & E - no problem. We'll fix.

Will re-send later today. Thank you very much!

On Oct 22, 2015 8:36 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

Good Morning Tara,

I just looked the database over, per your guidance, just the first tab, pending any other changes (hopefully none) that must be made.

I will reference things based on the letters in your e-mail.

a) & b) The numbers are correct, but there is a different issue that arises, which, when I noticed it here, led me to check other parcels that might have the same situation, and it exists. The adjustments being made -- 7% marketing, 40% and 25% per LAUSD's rules -- should be entered in column BI where the assessment is finally calculated. Otherwise, we end up with "wrong" square or linear footages showing in the columns. I apologize for not bringing this up earlier, I did not know this was the correct way to do it.

c) OK

d) I see the problem has been fixed, but, ironically a related problem has cropped up. In column BJ, the ABSENCE of \$ signs in the denominator is creating a problem when the data is sorted. It doesn't make sense, sorting the data causes the percentages to disappear and error messages to appear. So the denominator should read "\$BI\$466.

e) New item, the ownership on 4286030903 should be LA City, not State of Calif.

Let me know if anything is unclear.

G

On Tue, Oct 13, 2015 at 5:00 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Garen:

Here is the revised dbase.

- All edits are in RED font.

- I have temporarily unhidden all the columns between AC and BJ so that you can easily see exactly where I made the edits for the LAUSD property and the LA Public Library (LAPL) parcel. Also, if the edits caused a change in the total assessment/%, I also turned the total assessment and % fields red (just the LAUSD and LAPL parcels as discussed further below.)

Complete list of all changes:

a) 4238002902 - LAUSD - changed bldg SF based on architectural drawings with dimensions as furnished by LAUSD (total SF is 76287, but they only pay 40% on bldg sf per memo.) The 40% occurs in the formula in column AI.

b) 4238018900 - LA Public Library (this single parcel also contains a pocket park, a pedestrian path/walkway and surface parking) - there are two changes per discussion with Miranda et al after first draft MDP/ER review: 1) make this parcel Zone 2/apply Zone 2 rate (reasoning: it is not commercial-use + hours of operation are more consistent with Zone 2 parcels) and 2) remove marketing portion of the assessment (again, it is not a commercial use and does not benefit from marketing.) The removal of the 7% for marketing occurs in the formula in columns AI, AS and AZ (all shown in red font) as a reduction to the bldg, lot and frontage #s (*0.93.)

c) Mailing address have been added for a few dozen parcels - most of these were condos that were fairly new/not recorded when we did the original dbase. All are in red. We also re-ran all the condos listed under owner THORNTON VENICE OWNER LLC to see if they had sold, but they still show the same owner of record.

d) I do believe that I found and removed the \$ in the formulas that you said were throwing off the sort. I did a sort for \$ in formulas and removed them all. You telling me what was wrong was a big help - it made them easy to find. Thank you!

2) The main database (first tab) is 100% updated for your review. There are no more changes unless our second review raises more issues. I will be reviewing and updating the remaining tabs in the attached (all of which are just tables used for the MDP or ER) in the next day or so, although I believe all but the Public Parcels tab are automated. **I will resubmit the database to you then, with the red font removed, and the superfluous columns between AC and BJ hidden (the "streamlined" view I normally send you.)**

Please let me know if you have any questions!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St. #110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621



Re: 2013.10.13 Venice database

1 message

Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 4:30 PM

To: Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

OK, Tara, that works just as well.

Separately, Dennis was double checking and caught two basic types of errors. One is that some parking lots are being assessed as building square footage. The other is building square footage that is missing or should not exist pair of condos that somehow ended up with no building square footage. I have rounded up the appropriate sf for these.

Below, details by parcels number:

4286003020 5200 is parking, not assessable

4286003021 6720 is parking, not assessable

4286006015 parking, not assessable

4286006016 parking, not assessable

4286008007 0 sf- county is now showing 0 for this parcel's building sf

4286009001 parking, not assessable

4286009018 add 2010 sf, has more buildings on the parcel, county's database structured suc that this can easily be missed

4286009022 parking, not assessable

4286012035 8228

4286012038 parking, not assessable

4286028020 890

4286028021 4400

4286028022 4050

4286028023 3600

4286028024 4610

4286028025 1300

4286028026 3600

4286028027 4120

4286028028 4290

4286028029 4230

4286028030 3530

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 12:58 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

One more quick note. I started creating BTotalAdj, FTotalAdj, LTotalAdj columns, however, I immediately realized that approach has a big downside. It causes a problem with the assessment formula calculation. All of the assessment formulas for all adjusted parcels (at least 20) must then pull the building, lot, or frontage total from a different column than the non-adjusted parcels. Or else I have to carry over non-adjusted parcels' numbers into the adjusted column and calculate assessments using that new column (which would also be really confusing, since most parcels aren't adjusted.)

While I could do either of the above, it seems overly complicated and more prone to end up with inadvertently corrupted data. From a data standpoint, I think it's much easier to do what you originally suggested and move the adjustment calculations out of the bldg, lot, frontage and just apply to the total assessment. I don't love that scenario, but it is much cleaner/simpler. I suppose few lay people ever look at the database, so maybe that's just better. I will proceed along the lines you originally suggested.

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 9:49 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Well, I will swear up and down that I will remember :)

I have a great memory for most details (I remember my thought process that goes into decisions like these.)

But I'll go with your suggestion. I like it much better than having a final assessment that isn't actually based on the bldg, lot, frontage numbers being shown. I think that's really confusing for any lay person who looks at the data.

On Oct 22, 2015 9:41 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

Hi Tara,

Regarding South Park II, that's something we should have noticed and corrected.

But the problem is one of clarity and precision. Picture, eight years from now, we're compiling data, who's going to remember that these "invisible" adjustments were made?

I have a suggestion which will keep both the original, raw, data columns and the assessment columns clean.

Why not add a column for each of the three bases that we could name the "Btotal-adjusted" column (similarly for frontage and lot). This would contain either the adjusted figure or simply the original figure carried over.

Then, the assessment column would read the number from adjusted column.

This way, all concerns are addressed.

What do you think of this solution?

G

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 8:59 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

A&B

On SPII, this is how we did it, and our logic was as follows:

We made the reductions at the lowest level - we believe that the bldg, lot, and frontage figures should really only reflect what's actually being assessed. You can still see the unreduced figures by looking at the formula if your curious, but the unreduced figures are really moot. The reality is that there are really substantial differences for some of these parcels (actual vs. assessed quantities.) We think it's disingenuous (and confusing to the untrained person) to see bldg, lot, and frontage totals on which the assessment is not actually based at all.

We would respectfully appeal/ask you to reconsider our point of view before we make this change.

C, D & E - no problem. We'll fix.

Will re-send later today. Thank you very much!

On Oct 22, 2015 8:36 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
Good Morning Tara,

I just looked the database over, per your guidance, just the first tab, pending any other changes (hopefully none) that must be made.

I will reference things based on the letters in your e-mail.

a) & b) The numbers are correct, but there is a different issue that arises, which, when I noticed it here, led me to check other parcels that might have the same situation, and it exists. The adjustments being made -- 7% marketing, 40% and 25% per LAUSD's rules -- should be entered in column BI where the assessment is finally calculated. Otherwise, we end up with "wrong" square or linear footages showing in the columns. I apologize for not bringing this up earlier, I did not know this was the correct way to do it.

c) OK

d) I see the problem has been fixed, but, ironically a related problem has cropped up. In column BJ, the ABSENCE of \$ signs in the denominator is creating a problem when the data is sorted. It doesn't make sense, sorting the data causes the percentages to disappear and error messages to appear. So the denominator should read "\$BI\$466.

e) New item, the ownership on 4286030903 should be LA City, not State of Calif.

Let me know if anything is unclear.

G

On Tue, Oct 13, 2015 at 5:00 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:
Garen:

Here is the revised dbase.

- All edits are in RED font.

- I have temporarily unhidden all the columns between AC and BJ so that you can easily see exactly where I made the edits for the LAUSD property and the LA Public Library (LAPL) parcel. Also, if the edits caused a change in the total assessment/%, I also turned the total assessment and % fields red (just the LAUSD and LAPL parcels as discussed further below.)

Complete list of all changes:

a) 4238002902 - LAUSD - changed bldg SF based on architectural drawings with dimensions as furnished by LAUSD (total SF is 76287, but they only pay 40% on bldg sf per memo.) The 40% occurs in the formula in column AI.

b) 4238018900 - LA Public Library (this single parcel also contains a pocket park, a pedestrian path/walkway and surface parking) - there are two changes per discussion with Miranda et al after first draft MDP/ER review: 1) make this parcel Zone 2/apply Zone 2 rate (reasoning: it is not commercial-use + hours of operation are more consistent with Zone 2 parcels) and 2) remove marketing portion of the assessment (again, it is not a commercial use and does not benefit from marketing.) The removal of the 7% for marketing occurs in the formula in columns AI, AS and AZ (all shown in red font) as a reduction to the bldg, lot and frontage #s (*0.93.)

c) Mailing address have been added for a few dozen parcels - most of these were condos that were fairly new/not recorded when we did the original dbase. All are in red. We also re-ran all the condos listed under owner THORNTON VENICE OWNER LLC to see if they had sold, but they still show the same owner of record.

d) I do believe that I found and removed the \$ in the formulas that you said were throwing off the sort. I did a sort for \$ in formulas and removed them all. You telling me what was wrong was a big help - it made them easy to find. Thank you!

2) The main database (first tab) is 100% updated for your review. There are no more changes unless our second review raises more issues. I will be reviewing and updating the remaining tabs in the attached (all of which are just tables used for the MDP or ER) in the next day or so, although I believe all but the Public

Parcels tab are automated. **I will resubmit the database to you then, with the red font removed, and the superfluous columns between AC and BJ hidden (the "streamlined" view I normally send you.)**

Please let me know if you have any questions!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621



Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Re: 2013.10.13 Venice database

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>
To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 4:50 PM

Ok :(Losing my mind slightly.
I'd just finalized the dbase and was about to click send. Back to it. Will review and send later.

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 4:30 PM, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:
OK, Tara, that works just as well.

Separately, Dennis was double checking and caught two basic types of errors. One is that some parking lots are being assessed as building square footage. The other is building square footage that is missing or should not exist pair of condos that somehow ended up with no building square footage. I have rounded up the appropriate sf for these.

Below, details by parcels number:

4286003020 5200 is parking, not assessable

4286003021 6720 is parking, not assessable

4286006015 parking, not assessable

4286006016 parking, not assessable

4286008007 0 sf- county is now showing 0 for this parcel's building sf

4286009001 parking, not assessable

4286009018 add 2010 sf, has more buildings on the parcel, county's database structured such that this can easily be missed

4286009022 parking, not assessable

4286012035 8228

4286012038 parking, not assessable

4286028020 890

4286028021 4400

4286028022 4050

4286028023 3600
4286028024 4610
4286028025 1300
4286028026 3600
4286028027 4120
4286028028 4290
4286028029 4230
4286028030 3530
4286028031 3190

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 12:58 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

One more quick note. I started creating BTotalAdj, FTotalAdj, LTotalAdj columns, however, I immediately realized that approach has a big downside. It causes a problem with the assessment formula calculation. All of the assessment formulas for all adjusted parcels (at least 20) must then pull the building, lot, or frontage total from a different column than the non-adjusted parcels. Or else I have to carry over non-adjusted parcels' numbers into the adjusted column and calculate assessments using that new column (which would also be really confusing, since most parcels aren't adjusted.)

While I could do either of the above, it seems overly complicated and more prone to end up with inadvertently corrupted data. From a data standpoint, I think it's much easier to do what you originally suggested and move the adjustment calculations out of the bldg, lot, frontage and just apply to the total assessment. I don't love that scenario, but it is much cleaner/simpler. I suppose few lay people ever look at the database, so maybe that's just better. I will proceed along the lines you originally suggested.

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 9:49 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Well, I will swear up and down that I will remember :)

I have a great memory for most details (I remember my thought process that goes into decisions like these.)

But I'll go with your suggestion. I like it much better than having a final assessment that isn't actually based on the bldg, lot, frontage numbers being shown. I think that's really confusing for any lay person who looks at the data.

On Oct 22, 2015 9:41 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

Hi Tara,

Regarding South Park II, that's something we should have noticed and corrected.

But the problem is one of clarity and precision. Picture, eight years from now, we're compiling data, who's going to remember that these "invisible" adjustments were made?

I have a suggestion which will keep both the original, raw, data columns and the assessment columns clean.

Why not add a column for each of the three bases that we could name the "Btotal-adjusted" column (similarly for frontage and lot). This would contain either the adjusted figure or simply the original figure carried over.

Then, the assessment column would read the number from adjusted column.

This way, all concerns are addressed.

What do you think of this solution?

G

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 8:59 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

A&B

On SPII, this is how we did it, and our logic was as follows:

We made the reductions at the lowest level - we believe that the bldg, lot, and frontage figures should really only reflect what's actually being assessed. You can still see the unreduced figures by looking at the formula if your curious, but the unreduced figures are really moot. The reality is that there are really substantial differences for some of these parcels (actual vs. assessed quantities.) We think it's disingenuous (and confusing to the untrained person) to see bldg, lot, and frontage totals on which the assessment is not actually based at all.

We would respectfully appeal/ask you to reconsider our point of view before we make this change.

C, D & E - no problem. We'll fix.

Will re-send later today. Thank you very much!

On Oct 22, 2015 8:36 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

Good Morning Tara,

I just looked the database over, per your guidance, just the first tab, pending any other changes (hopefully none) that must be made.

I will reference things based on the letters in your e-mail.

a) & b) The numbers are correct, but there is a different issue that arises, which, when I noticed it here, led me to check other parcels that might have the same situation, and it exists. The adjustments being made – 7% marketing, 40% and 25% per LAUSD's rules – should be entered in column BI where the assessment is finally calculated. Otherwise, we end up with "wrong" square or linear footages showing in the columns. I apologize for not bringing this up earlier, I did not know this was the correct way to do it.

c) OK

d) I see the problem has been fixed, but, ironically a related problem has cropped up. In column BJ, the ABSENCE of \$ signs in the denominator is creating a problem when the data is sorted. It doesn't make sense, sorting the data causes the percentages to disappear and error messages to appear. So the denominator should read "\$BI\$466.

e) New item, the ownership on 4286030903 should be LA City, not State of Calif.

Let me know if anything is unclear.

G

On Tue, Oct 13, 2015 at 5:00 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Garen:

Here is the revised dbase.

- All edits are in RED font.

- I have temporarily unhidden all the columns between AC and BJ so that you can easily see exactly where I made the edits for the LAUSD property and the LA Public Library (LAPL) parcel. Also, if the edits caused a change in the total assessment/%, I also turned the total assessment and % fields red (just the LAUSD and LAPL parcels as discussed further below.)

Complete list of all changes:

a) 4238002902 - LAUSD - changed bldg SF based on architectural drawings with dimensions as furnished by LAUSD (total SF is 76287, but they only pay 40% on bldg sf per memo.) The 40% occurs in the formula in column AI.

b) 4238018900 - LA Public Library (this single parcel also contains a pocket park, a pedestrian path/walkway and surface parking) - there are two changes per discussion with Miranda et al after first

draft MDP/ER review: 1) make this parcel Zone 2/apply Zone 2 rate (reasoning: it is not commercial-use + hours of operation are more consistent with Zone 2 parcels) and 2) remove marketing portion of the assessment (again, it is not a commercial use and does not benefit from marketing.) The removal of the 7% for marketing occurs in the formula in columns AI, AS and AZ (all shown in red font) as a reduction to the bldg, lot and frontage #s (*0.93.)

c) Mailing address have been added for a few dozen parcels - most of these were condos that were fairly new/not recorded when we did the original dbase. All are in red. We also re-ran all the condos listed under owner THORNTON VENICE OWNER LLC to see if they had sold, but they still show the same owner of record.

d) I do believe that I found and removed the \$ in the formulas that you said were throwing off the sort. I did a sort for \$ in formulas and removed them all. You telling me what was wrong was a big help - it made them easy to find. Thank you!

2) The main database (first tab) is 100% updated for your review. There are no more changes unless our second review raises more issues. I will be reviewing and updating the remaining tabs in the attached (all of which are just tables used for the MDP or ER) in the next day or so, although I believe all but the Public Parcels tab are automated. **I will resubmit the database to you then, with the red font removed, and the superfluous columns between AC and BJ hidden (the "streamlined" view I normally send you.)**

Please let me know if you have any questions!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--
Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621



Re: 2013.10.13 Venice database

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 5:24 PM

To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Thank you for the edits. I was just frustrated. I spent half a day cutting and pasting formulas and ensuring data integrity was maintained. It was a miserable grind, and I got your email just when I thought I was done.

Looks like someone demolished the structure at 4286008007 and already has a new one under construction. I'll make a note that we should check for an update before we go to ballot.

The last group (Thornton Place/OFW condos) I'm embarrassed by - I just reran those to check for updated owner info and failed to note the absence of building SF :) I think that when we did the original dbase, those were brand new APNs (recent subdivision) and were missing most data.

These changes will all be included in the new dbase I'm about to send. As these affect assessments, please kindly confirm that they are now correct/you are satisfied before I proceed to redo all the numbers and re-insert the new tables into the revised MDP. Doing that repeatedly is really maddening. And even worse for Ed than for me.

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 4:30 PM, Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

OK, Tara, that works just as well.

Separately, Dennis was double checking and caught two basic types of errors. One is that some parking lots are being assessed as building square footage. The other is building square footage that is missing or should not exist pair of condos that somehow ended up with no building square footage. I have rounded up the appropriate sf for these.

Below, details by parcels number:

4286003020 5200 is parking, not assessable

4286003021 6720 is parking, not assessable

4286006015 parking, not assessable

4286006016 parking, not assessable

4286008007 0 sf- county is now showing 0 for this parcel's building sf

4286009001 parking, not assessable

4286009018 add 2010 sf, has more buildings on the parcel, county's database structured such that this can easily be missed

4286009022 parking, not assessable

4286012035 8228

4286012038 parking, not assessable

4286028020 890

4286028021 4400

4286028022 4050
4286028023 3600
4286028024 4610
4286028025 1300
4286028026 3600
4286028027 4120
4286028028 4290
4286028029 4230
4286028030 3530
4286028031 3190

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 12:58 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

One more quick note. I started creating BTotalAdj, FTotalAdj, LTotalAdj columns, however, I immediately realized that approach has a big downside. It causes a problem with the assessment formula calculation. All of the assessment formulas for all adjusted parcels (at least 20) must then pull the building, lot, or frontage total from a different column than the non-adjusted parcels. Or else I have to carry over non-adjusted parcels' numbers into the adjusted column and calculate assessments using that new column (which would also be really confusing, since most parcels aren't adjusted.)

While I could do either of the above, it seems overly complicated and more prone to end up with inadvertently corrupted data. From a data standpoint, I think it's much easier to do what you originally suggested and move the adjustment calculations out of the bldg, lot, frontage and just apply to the total assessment. I don't love that scenario, but it is much cleaner/simpler. I suppose few lay people ever look at the database, so maybe that's just better. I will proceed along the lines you originally suggested.

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 9:49 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Well, I will swear up and down that I will remember :)

I have a great memory for most details (I remember my thought process that goes into decisions like these.)

But I'll go with your suggestion. I like it much better than having a final assessment that isn't actually based on the bldg, lot, frontage numbers being shown. I think that's really confusing for any lay person who looks at the data.

On Oct 22, 2015 9:41 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

Hi Tara,

Regarding South Park II, that's something we should have noticed and corrected.

But the problem is one of clarity and precision. Picture, eight years from now, we're compiling data, who's going to remember that these "invisible" adjustments were made?

I have a suggestion which will keep both the original, raw, data columns and the assessment columns clean.

Why not add a column for each of the three bases that we could name the "Btotal-adjusted" column (similarly for frontage and lot). This would contain either the adjusted figure or simply the original figure carried over.

Then, the assessment column would read the number from adjusted column.

This way, all concerns are addressed.

What do you think of this solution?

G

On Thu, Oct 22, 2015 at 8:59 AM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

A&B

On SPII, this is how we did it, and our logic was as follows:

We made the reductions at the lowest level - we believe that the bldg, lot, and frontage figures should really only reflect what's actually being assessed. You can still see the unreduced figures by looking at the formula if your curious, but the unreduced figures are really moot. The reality is that there are really substantial differences for some of these parcels (actual vs. assessed quantities.) We think it's disingenuous (and confusing to the untrained person) to see bldg, lot, and frontage totals on which the assessment is not actually based at all.

We would respectfully appeal/ask you to reconsider our point of view before we make this change.

C, D & E - no problem. We'll fix.

Will re-send later today. Thank you very much!

On Oct 22, 2015 8:36 AM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

Good Morning Tara,

I just looked the database over, per your guidance, just the first tab, pending any other changes (hopefully none) that must be made.

I will reference things based on the letters in your e-mail.

a) & b) The numbers are correct, but there is a different issue that arises, which, when I noticed it here, led me to check other parcels that might have the same situation, and it exists. The adjustments being made -- 7% marketing, 40% and 25% per LAUSD's rules -- should be entered in column BI where the assessment is finally calculated. Otherwise, we end up with "wrong" square or linear footages showing in the columns. I apologize for not bringing this up earlier, I did not know this was the correct way to do it.

c) OK

d) I see the problem has been fixed, but, ironically a related problem has cropped up. In column BJ, the ABSENCE of \$ signs in the denominator is creating a problem when the data is sorted. It doesn't make sense, sorting the data causes the percentages to disappear and error messages to appear. So the denominator should read "\$BI\$466.

e) New item, the ownership on 4286030903 should be LA City, not State of Calif.

Let me know if anything is unclear.

G

On Tue, Oct 13, 2015 at 5:00 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

Garen:

Here is the revised dbase.

- All edits are in RED font.

- I have temporarily unhidden all the columns between AC and BJ so that you can easily see exactly where I made the edits for the LAUSD property and the LA Public Library (LAPL) parcel. Also, if the edits caused a change in the total assessment/%, I also turned the total assessment and % fields red (just the LAUSD and LAPL parcels as discussed further below.)

Complete list of all changes:

a) 4238002902 - LAUSD - changed bldg SF based on architectural drawings with dimensions as furnished by LAUSD (total SF is 76287, but they only pay 40% on bldg sf per memo.) The 40% occurs in the formula in column AI.

b) 4238018900 - LA Public Library (this single parcel also contains a pocket park, a pedestrian path/walkway and surface parking) - there are two changes per discussion with Miranda et al after first draft MDP/ER review: 1) make this parcel Zone 2/apply Zone 2 rate (reasoning: it is not commercial-use + hours of operation are more consistent with Zone 2 parcels) and 2) remove marketing portion of the assessment (again, it is not a commercial use and does not benefit from marketing.) The removal of the 7% for marketing occurs in the formula in columns AI, AS and AZ (all shown in red font) as a reduction to the bldg, lot and frontage #s (*0.93.)

c) Mailing address have been added for a few dozen parcels - most of these were condos that were fairly new/not recorded when we did the original dbase. All are in red. We also re-ran all the condos listed under owner THORNTON VENICE OWNER LLC to see if they had sold, but they still show the same owner of record.

d) I do believe that I found and removed the \$ in the formulas that you said were throwing off the sort. I did a sort for \$ in formulas and removed them all. You telling me what was wrong was a big help - it made them easy to find. Thank you!

2) The main database (first tab) is 100% updated for your review. There are no more changes unless our second review raises more issues. I will be reviewing and updating the remaining tabs in the attached (all of which are just tables used for the MDP or ER) in the next day or so, although I believe all but the Public Parcels tab are automated. **I will resubmit the database to you then, with the red font removed, and the superfluous columns between AC and BJ hidden (the "streamlined" view I normally send you.)**

Please let me know if you have any questions!

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
DEVINE STRATEGIES
645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
Los Angeles, CA 90015
310.430.5121
tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES

Political - Legislative - Economic Development - Planning & Entitlements - Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621

--

Garen Yegparian
213/978-2621